		TO A TO A CONTROL OF		1. CONTRACT	ID CODE	PAGE OF PAGES
AMENDMENT OF SOLICIT	'ATION/MODIF	TICATION OF CONTRACT		J		1   12
2. AMENDMENT/MODIFICATION NO. 0001	3. EFFECTIVE DATE 01-Jun-2015	4. REQUISITION/PURCHASE REQ. NO. N5706115RC0201Z			5. PROJE	CCT NO.(If applicable)
6. ISSUED BY CODE	N68836	7. ADMINISTERED BY (If other than item 6)		COI	DE	
NAVSUP FLC JACKSONVILLE CONTRACTS DIV WILLIAM JORDAN 110 YORKTOWN AVE, 3RD FLOOR NAS JACKSONVILLE FL 32212-0097		See Item 6				
8. NAME AND ADDRESS OF CONTRACT OR	(No., Street, County,	State and Zip Code)	X S	A. AMENDMI N68836-15-T-0	ENT OF 204	SOLICITATION NO.
				OB. DATED (SE 20-May-2015		
						ACT/ORDER NO.
CODE	FACILITY COI	DE		OB. DATED (	SEE ITE	M 13)
		APPLIES TO AMENDMENTS OF SOLIC	_	TIONS		
X The above numbered solicitation is amended as set for	rth in Item 14. The hour and	date specified for receipt of Offer	X is	s extended,	is not e	extended.
(a) By completing Items 8 and 15, and returning or (c) By separate letter or telegram which includes a RECEIVED AT THE PLACE DESIGNATED FOR TREJECTION OF YOUR OFFER. If by virtue of this provided each telegram or letter makes reference to the 12. ACCOUNTING AND APPROPRIATION I	reference to the solicitation THE RECEIPT OF OFFERS amendment you desire to cha e solicitation and this amend	and amendment numbers. FAILURE OF YOUR A PRIOR TO THE HOUR AND DATE SPECIFIED unge an offer already submitted, such change may b	ACKNO O MAY oe made	OWLEDGMENT T RESULT IN by telegram or let	ГО ВЕ	d;
		ΓΟ MODIFICATIONS OF CONTRACTS CT/ORDER NO. AS DESCRIBED IN ITE				
A. THIS CHANGE ORDER IS ISSUED PURS CONTRACT ORDER NO. IN ITEM 10A	SUANT TO: (Specify a				IADE IN	ТНЕ
B. THE ABOVE NUMBERED CONTRACT/ office, appropriation date, etc.) SET FOR	TH IN ITEM 14, PUR	SUANT TO THE AUTHORITY OF FAI			is change	es in paying
C. THIS SUPPLEMENT AL AGREEMENT	IS ENTERED INTO PU	JRSUANT TO AUTHORITY OF:				
D. OTHER (Specify type of modification and	d authority)					
E. IMPORTANT: Contractor is not,	is required to sig	gn this document and return	copi	es to the issuing	g office.	
<ul> <li>14. DESCRIPTION OF AMENDMENT/MODIL where feasible.)</li> <li>The purpose of this amendment is to:</li> <li>1. Update clauses 52.212-1 &amp; 52.212-2 to inc.</li> <li>2. Update Additional Information Section with</li> <li>3. The closing date for submission of quotes</li> </ul>	clude evaluation factor	's. I CONTRACTOR PERFORMANCE EVALU	UATK	ON SURVEY.		
All other information remains unchanged.						
Except as provided herein, all terms and conditions of the 15A. NAME AND TITLE OF SIGNER (Type of		9A or 10A, as heretofore changed, remains unchan 16A. NAME AND TITLE OF CO				pe or print)
, JI		TEL:		EMAIL:	, J.	/
15B. CONTRACTOR/OFFEROR	15C. DATE SIGNE			LIVI/AIL.		16C. DATE SIGNED
		BY				
(Signature of person authorized to sign)	_	(Signature of Contracting Off	ficer)			01-Jun-2015

SECTION	SF 30 BI	OCK 14	CONTINUE	ATION PAGE

SECTION	SF 1449 -	CONTINUA	TION	SHEET

The	following	have been	modified:
	ADDITIC	NAL INF	ORMATION

Submit the following information:	
TOTAL PROPOSAL AMOUNT: \$	
CAGE CODE:	
DUNS:	

## Additional Information for N68836-15-T-0204

FSC: R706 NAICS: 541614

Solicitation N68836-15-T-0204 To obtain logistics and life support to expeditionary naval forces operating in El Salvador on the USNS Comfort during Continuing Promise 2015 mission on 09-26 June 2015 in El Salvador.

**NOTE:** When requesting a copy of this solicitation, provide your company's <u>CAGE Code</u> and <u>DUNS</u>.

Bid Schedule (attachment) is to be submitted in EXCEL format. Only put the unit price in the **YELLOW** column and total will automatically populate.

Also, when corresponding with us, please make sure that you include all of us on your e-mail. Our contact information is listed below:

Bill Jordan, Contracting Officer	904-542-4838	william.r.jordan1@navy.mil
Alise Taylor-Sindab, Contracting Officer	904-542-1265	Alise.taylor-sindab@navy.mil
LCDR Doug Murphy, Contract Specialist	904-542-1076	Douglas.r.murphy@navy.mil
LT Blake Harpel, Contract Specialist	904-542-6449	blake.harpel@navy.mil
Cynthia Vorachack-Hogan, Contracting Officer	904-542-1255	oulay.vorachackhogan@navy.mil

**CLOSING DATE AND TIME FOR QUOTES**: The closing date for receipt of quotes/offers is: **11:00 a.m. EST** (**Eastern Standard Time**) on **Tuesday 2 June 2015.** Facsimile (See FAR Provision 52.215-5) and/or e-mail proposal will be accepted. Refer to FAR Clause 52.212-1 regarding Instruction to Offerors and "Late Submissions".

## YOUR SUBMITTAL PACKAGE MUST CONTAIN THE FOLLOWING DOCUMENTS:

\*\*See FAR Clause 52.212-1, Page: 29 \*\*

NOTE: All correspondence and/or submissions should be sent to all persons listed below:

alise.taylor-sindab@navy.mil douglas.r.murphy@navy.mil. blake.harpel@navy.mil oulay.vorachackhogan@navy.mil william.r.jordan1@navy.mil

# CONTRACTOR PERFORMANCE EVALUATION SURVEY COVER SHEET

Request for Proposal Number: N68836-15-T-0204 El Salvador.

Submit completed Cover Sheet and Survey via fax or email to:

## CONTRACTING DEPARTMENT

Fleet Logistics Center

Attn: YOUR NAME, Contracting Officer

110 Yorktown Avenue, 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor Jacksonville, FL 32212-0097 Phone: (904) 542-1255

Fax: (904) 542-1095

e-mail: oulay.vorachackhogan@navy.mil

Name and address of offeror questionnaire is being completed for:	
Name, title and phone number of person completing questionnaire:	
rvaine, title and phone number of person completing questionnaire.	
Name/Title:	
Phone Number:	
Provide relevant information:	
N C	
Name of company:	
Contract Number:	<del></del>
Contract Type:	<del></del>
Contract Amount:	<del></del>
Contract Period of Performance (including all options)	
Product/Service Description:	
Length of time your firm has been involved with this company:	

## RATING SCALE

Please use the following ratings to answer the questions. If you are unable to rate an item because it was not a requirement, never an issue, or you have no knowledge of the item in question, then you should mark "NA".

#### **EVALUATION CRITERIA**

- **Acceptable -** The company's performance was satisfactory and you would consider doing business with them again. There were minor performance problems which were satisfactorily corrected.
- **Unacceptable** The company's performance was entirely unsatisfactory and you would not do business with them again under any circumstances. There were serious performance issues with the contractor for which the contractor's corrective

actions were ineffective.

NOTE:

For statements indicating "Unacceptable" or "Acceptable", please provide an explanation in the comments section of the survey.

# CONTRACTOR PERFORMANCE EVALUATION SURVEY

	Unacceptable	Acceptable
A. QUALITY OF PRODUCT OR SERVICE:	_	
<ol> <li>The Contractor provided a product or service that conformed to contract requirements, specifications, and standards of good workmanship.</li> </ol>	d	
(2) The Contractor submitted accurate reports.		
(3) The Contractor utilized personnel that were appropriate to the effort performed.	ne	
B. COST CONTROL:		
(1) The Contractor performed the effort within the estimated cost/price.		
(2) The Contractor submitted accurate invoices on a timely basis	s.	
(3) The Contractor demonstrated cost efficiencies in performing the required effort.		
(4) The actual costs/rates realized closely reflected the negotiate costs/rates.	ed	
C. <u>SCHEDULE:</u>		
(1) The tasks required under this effort were performed in a timely manner and in accordance with the period of performance of the contract.		
(2) The Contractor was responsive to technical and/or contractual direction.	al	
D. <u>BUSINESS RELATIONSHIPS:</u>		
(1) The Contractor demonstrated effective management over the effort performed.		
(2) The Contractor maintained an open line of communication so that the Contracting Officer's Representative (COR) and/or Technical Point of Contact (TPOC) were apprised of technical, cost, and schedule issues.	О	
(3) The Contractor presented information and correspondence in a clear, concise, and businesslike manner.	1	
(4) The Contractor promptly notified the COR, TPOC, and/or Contracting Officer in a timely manner regarding urgent issues.		
(5) The Contractor cooperated with the Government in providing flexible, proactive, and effective recommended solutions to critical program issues.	g	
(6) The Contractor made timely award to, and demonstrated effective management of, its subcontractors.		
(7) The Contractor demonstrated an effective small/small	-	

disadvantaged business subcontracting program.		
	Unacceptable	Acceptable
E. CUSTOMER SATISFACTION:		
(1) The products/services provided adequately met the needs of the program.		
(2) The Contractor was able to perform with minimal or no		
direction from the COR or the TPOC.  (3) I am satisfied with the performance of the Contractor under		
this effort.		
F. KEY PERSONNEL:		
(1) The labor turnover in key personnel labor categories was minimal and did not adversely affect Contractor performance.		
(2) The Contractor proposed qualified personnel to fulfill the requirements of the contract.		
G. OTHER:		
(2) Was the contract terminated for default? ( ) Yes ( ) No		
f you answered "Yes", provide an explanation.		
COMMENTS: (Required for ALL Unacceptable Ratings)		
Print Name/Title		

#### 52.212-1 INSTRUCTIONS TO OFFERORS--COMMERCIAL ITEMS (APR 2014)

The Contractor shall furnish Request for Proposal Submission Package. Email and/or facsimile submissions are acceptable.

Therefore, each offeror's initial proposal should contain their best terms from a technical and price standpoint.

The Government reserves the right to conduct discussions if it's later determined to be necessary.

At the time of the solicitation closing date, offerors shall electronically submit the information specified in paragraphs (1) through (3) below to all of the following personnel: Ms. Alise Taylor-Sindab at <a href="mailto:alise.sindab@navy.mil">alise.sindab@navy.mil</a>, LT Blake Harpel at <a href="mailto:blake.harpel@navy.mil">blake.harpel@navy.mil</a>, Mrs. Cynthia Vorachack-Hogan at oulay.vorachackhogan@navy.mil and Mr. William Jordan at <a href="mailto:william.r.jordan1@navy.mil">william.r.jordan1@navy.mil</a>

(1) Part I – Past Performance - Offerors are required to provide information on at least two (2), but not more than four (4), of the firm's most recently completed service contracts (either Governmental or commercial) that are currently active (or were active within the past three years) for the same or similar types of services as those detailed in the Statement of Work (SOW).

Offerors may submit performance data regarding current contract performance as long as a minimum of one (1) year of performance has been completed as of the closing date of this RFQ.

The offeror has both the duty and the discretion to determine which of its prior services contracts are most relevant to the requirements described in this solicitation. The offeror may also submit relevant service contracts performed by subcontractors that will perform under this contract, but under no circumstances may an offeror submit more than four (4) contracts for review, regardless of whether the contracts were performed by the offeror, subcontractor(s), or any combination thereof. If subcontractor contracts are submitted, the offeror must also clearly indicate the percentage of work that the subcontractor(s) will perform in the course of the contract. Any submission(s) in excess of this stated limit will be excluded by the Government. The Government will choose the excluded contract(s) at random, or in any manner that the Government, in its absolute discretion, deems appropriate, without any consideration for the best interests of the offeror.

Offerors should provide an explanation describing the nature of the services contracts submitted, specifically, whether they are regional contracts, or single or multiple services contracts for one country for one timeframe. The information shall be submitted in a brief narrative (one page per contract) and in accordance with **Past Performance Questionnaire**. The Past Performance Questionnaire completed and response information thoroughly completed in order for the Government to contact. The references will then forward the completed questionnaires to all of the following personnel:Ms. Alise Taylor-Sindab at <a href="mailto:alise.taylor-sindab@navy.mil">alise.taylor-sindab@navy.mil</a>, Mrs. Cynthia Vorachack-Hogan at oulay.vorachackhogan@navy.mil, William Jordan at <a href="mailto:william.r.jordan1@navy.mil">william.r.jordan1@navy.mil</a> and LT Blake Harpel at <a href="mailto:blake.harpel@navy.mil">blake.harpel@navy.mil</a>.

If the offeror possesses no relevant past performance, it should affirmatively state this fact in its proposal. Failure to submit the completed narratives and Past Performance Reference Sheet Questionnaires shall be considered certification (by signature on the proposal) that the offeror has no past performance for like or similar items for the Government to evaluate.

(2) Part II – Written Technical Proposal -The offeror's proposal shall consist of a written submission to the Government containing the Evaluation Factors 1 through 4 listed below. The technical proposal should not exceed 7 pages. These documents shall include each of the following items addressed in the order as they are listed below:

#### **EVALUATION FACTORS:**

1. A description of your organization's ability to manage and organize multiple requirements.

- 2. A description of your ability or flexibility to respond to changing schedules if necessary.
- 3. A description of your ability to obtain, acquire and deliver the equipment, material and supplies set forth in the Statement of Work (SOW).
- 4. A description of your ability to manage the invoicing and payment process.
- (3) **Part III Price Proposal** The offeror shall provide prices on each CLIN as shown on the SF1449 and fill in the detail price table. The prices must be in **US Dollars**. The pricing will be used for "evaluation" for selecting the offerors with the Lowest Price Technically Acceptable (LPTA).

Instructions to Offerors: The items to be procured are set forth in the SF1449 Bid Schedule and supplemented by the Excel spreadsheet (Breakdown of Supplies/Equipment) – **Attachment.** Offerors shall input unit price only (YELLOW column), the extended total amounts will automatically populate to the offeror's overall total price accordingly. The offeror shall insert the total price for each CLIN (Item Numbers 0001- through 0002) amount on the SF1449, Section B – Schedule of Supplies/Services Unit Price and insert the total amount of proposal in Section C, Page 4.

The prices in the pricing schedule will include mobilization, demobilization, shipping and any other cost the contractor will incur. These items shall not be separately priced.

All items covered under contract may be performed during the performance period of the contract. Offerors are required to provide prices for each CLIN.

Additional Information. Each offeror shall also complete and submit the following documentation, which must be submitted by the date and time specified for receipt of offers: 11:00 am ET (Eastern Time), Tuesday, 2 June 2015.

This RFP does not authorize alternate proposals with respect to specific terms or conditions of this RFP, any objection to any of the terms and conditions of this RFP will make the offer unacceptable and not considered for award on initial offers.

The completion and submission to the Government of the above items will constitute an offer (proposal) and will indicate the offeror's unconditional assent to the terms and conditions in this RFP and in any attachments hereto.

## **PROPOSAL FORMAT:**

The offeror is required to submit one electronic copy of its proposal and sent by e-mail to both of the following personnel: Ms. Alise Taylor-Sindab at alise.taylor-sindab@navy.mil, Mrs. Cynthia Vorachack-Hogan at oulay.vorachackhogan@navy.mil, William Jordan at william.r.jordan1@navy.mil and LT Blake Harpel at blake.harpel@navy.mil .

The proposal must be in .pdf format except the pricing spreadsheet must be in EXCEL format.

The proposal and other information must be provided in accordance with the following table of contents and limitations:

The package shall include the following:

## **Tab 1. Contract Information**

The offeror shall submit the following pages:

- 1. Signed 1449: pages 1-4
- 2. FAR Clause 52.209-5.
- 3. FAR Clause 52.212-3.
- 4. DFAR Clause 252.247-7022.

#### Tab 2. Past Performance

Past Performance Data Information Sheet and Questionnaire.

#### Tab 3. Technical Proposal: (Technical Proposals shall not exceed 7 pages)

Technical Capabilities/Approach

## <u>Tab 4. Cost Factor – Price Proposal</u>

Bid Schedule – Excel spreadsheet must be submitted in EXCEL format.

The page size is 8.5x 11 double spaced. The font for text shall be 12 point or larger and at least one inch margins all the way around. Text smaller than 12 point may only be used in charts and tables. The page limits specified by the solicitation are inclusive of appendix, tables, diagrams, matrices, title pages, page separators, etc. Pages exceeding assigned limits will <u>not</u> be considered for evaluation.

(End of provision)

#### 52.212-2 EVALUATION--COMMERCIAL ITEMS (OCT 2014)

#### BASIS OF AWARD: LOWEST PRICED TECHNICAL ACCEPTABLE OFFEROR

- (a) The Government will award a contract resulting from this solicitation to the responsible offeror whose offer conforming to the solicitation will be most advantageous to the Government, price and other factors considered. The following factors shall be used to evaluate offers:
- 1. An offer must be acceptable, taking no exception to the terms and conditions, in order for the offeror to be eligible for award.
- 2. The following evaluation factors shall be used:

#### PAST PERFORMANCE

Factor 1 - Past performance - Acceptable/Unacceptable

Past Performance is very important, but not more than Price. Unacceptable offerors on Past Performance will not move forward to be evaluated on technical or price.

 $\label{eq:past-performance} \textbf{PAST PERFORMANCE} \ (\textbf{Past Performance questionnaires do not count against the page count of the Technical Proposal)}$ 

#### TECHNICAL FACTORS

Factor 2 – Technical Capabilities and Approach - Acceptable/Unacceptable

#### **COST/PRICE FACTOR:**

Factor 3 – Price: Only offerors that have been evaluated "acceptable" in Factor 1 and Factor 2 will be able to move forward in order to be evaluated on price.

- 3. In order to select the awardees, the Government will compare the past performance and price of each technically acceptable offeror.
- 4. The Government intends to award a Firm Fix Price (FFP) contract to the offerors whose proposal presents the Lowest Price Technically Acceptable (LPTA) offer based on the prices offered in their Price Proposal.
- 5. The following factors shall be used to evaluate acceptable offers:

## 5.1 <u>Past Performance</u>

- (a) During the source selection process, the government will assess the relative risks associated with each offeror and proposal. It is important to note the distinction between proposal risk and performance risk.
- (1) Proposal risks are those associated with an offeror's proposed approach in meeting the government's requirements. Proposal risk is assessed by the proposal evaluators and is integrated into the rating of each specific evaluation factor and subfactor under the technical and price factors.
- (2) Performance risks are those associated with an offeror's likelihood of success in performing the solicitation's requirements as indicated by that offeror's record of past performance.
- (b) The government will conduct a performance risk assessment based upon the quality of the offeror's past performance as well as that of its proposed subcontractors, as it relates to the probability of successful accomplishment of the required effort. When assessing performance risk, the government will focus its inquiry on the past performance of the offeror and its proposed subcontracts as it relates to all solicitation requirements, such as price, schedule, and performance, including the contractor's record of conforming to specifications and to standards of good workmanship; the contractor's adherence to contract schedules, including the administrative aspects of performance; the contractor's history for reasonable and cooperative behavior and commitment to customer satisfaction; and generally, the contractor's business-like concern for the interests of its customers.
- (c) A significant achievement, problem, or lack of relevant data in any element of the work can become an important consideration in the source selection process. A negative finding under any element may result in an overall high performance risk assessment. Therefore, offerors are reminded to include all relevant past efforts, including demonstrated corrective actions, in their proposal. The lack of a performance record will result in a neutral performance risk assessment.
- (d) Offerors are cautioned that in conducting the performance risk assessment, the government may use data provided by the offeror in its proposal and data obtained from other sources including CPARS. Since the government may not necessarily interview all of the sources provided by the offerors, it is incumbent upon the offeror to explain the relevance of the data provided. Offerors are reminded that while the government may elect to consider data obtained from other sources, the burden of providing thorough and complete past performance information rests with the offerors.
- (e) There are two aspects to the past performance evaluation. The first is to evaluate the offeror's past performance to determine how relevant a recent effort accomplished by the offeror is to the effort to be acquired through the source selection (in accordance with ADDENDUM TO FAR 52.212-1, INSTRUCTION TO OFFERORS-COMMERCIAL ITEMS (OCT 2000)).

There are two levels of relevancy as shown below:

Rating	Description
Relevant	Present/past performance effort involved similar scope and
	magnitude of effort and complexities this solicitation requires.

Not Relevant	Present/past performance effort involved little or none of the scope
	and magnitude of effort and complexities this solicitation requires.

The second aspect of the past performance evaluation is to determine how well the contractor performed on the contracts. The past performance evaluation performed in support of a current source selection does not establish, create, or change the existing record and history of the offeror's past performance on past contracts; rather, the past performance evaluation process gathers information from customers on how well the offeror performed those past contracts.

The Past Performance Evaluation Team will review this past performance information and determine the quality and usefulness as it applies to performance confidence assessment. In conducting a performance confidence assessment, each offeror shall be assigned one of the ratings in the table below.

Acceptable	Past Performance: The offeror's performance of previously awarded relevant contract(s) met or exceeded contractual requirements. Performance over completed contracts was consistently of adequate or better quality or exhibited a trend of becoming so. The offeror's past performance record leads to an expectation of successful performance.
Unacceptable	Past Performance: The offeror's performance of previously awarded relevant contract(s) did not meet most contractual requirements and recovery did not occur with the period of performance. The assessed prior performance reflected serious problem(s) for which the offeror either failed to identify or implement corrective actions or for which corrective actions, implemented, or proposed to be implemented, were, or are expected to be, mostly ineffective. Performance over completed contracts was consistently of poor quality or exhibited a trend of becoming so. The offeror's past performance record leads to a strong expectation that successful performance will not be achieved or that it can occur only with greatly increased levels of Government management and oversight.

In the case of an offeror without a record of relevant past performance or for whom information on past performance is not available or so sparse that no meaningful past performance rating can be reasonably assigned, the offeror may not be evaluated favorably or unfavorably on past performance. Therefore, the offeror shall be determined to have unknown past performance. For evaluation purposes, "unknown" shall be considered "acceptable."

#### 5.2 <u>Technical Approach</u>

The Government will evaluate the offeror's Technical Approach on an acceptable/unacceptable basis. This determination will be made by reviewing and considering the information provided by the offeror in accordance with the solicitation clause entitled INSTRUCTIONS TO OFFERORS, 52.212-1.

In order to be considered ACCEPTABLE, offerors must address each of the numbered evaluation factors set forth in the Written Technical Proposal section of the INSTRUCTIONS TO OFFERORS 52.212-1(A)(1) in sufficient detail to enable the Government to reasonably determine that the offeror meets each of the bulleted requirements AND possesses the requisite ability to perform the contract.

However, offerors that simply reiterate the requirements and state that they possess the capability to perform them will be considered Unacceptable. The offeror must provide and/or explain the ability to obtain the necessary insurance, licenses and/or permits in connection with the work in specific company that work is to be performed. Additionally, the offeror must provide letters of commitment from any proposed subcontractor and/or supplier in connection with this requirement.

The offeror's proposal will be evaluated against these requirements to determine whether the proposal is acceptable or unacceptable, using the ratings and descriptions outlined here:

Acceptable	<b>Technical Capabilities/Approach:</b> The company has demons	trated an understanding of the
------------	--	--------------------------------

	services described in the RFP. The company's level of understanding of the work to be performed is thorough and comprehensive. Probability of successful contract performance is good.
Unacceptable	<b>Technical Capabilities/Approach:</b> The technical proposal has failed to demonstrate a
	satisfactory level of understanding of the requirement or capability in one or more areas of the
	technical proposal. The company lacks a basic understanding of work to be performed under the
	contract. This low level of understanding or capability would cause significant concern that
	there would be a high risk associated with the company's performance.

#### 5.3 Price

The Government will evaluate the price of each offeror as follows:

- a. The government intends to award a FFP contract with service beginning 09 June **through 26 June 2015.** Therefore proposals must include all costs for service on all CLINS to be considered for award.
- b. <u>Total Evaluated Price</u>: The total price will be used to determine the "Lowest Price Technically Acceptable (LPTA)" offerors.
  - 1) Ensure that unit prices, extension of each CLIN and total prices are correct.
  - 2) A price reasonableness determination will be made on each CLIN.
- c. A written notice of award or acceptance of an offer, mailed or otherwise furnished to the successful offeror within the time for acceptance specified in the offer, shall result in a binding contract without further action by either party. Before the offer's specified expiration time, the Government may accept an offer (or part of an offer), whether or not there are negotiations after its receipt, unless a written notice of withdrawal is received before award.

(End of provision)
(End of Summary of Changes)